December 14, 2000 Meeting Approved Minutes



ICTL Members

Richardson, Senator Melvin Howard, Superintendent

Marilyn

Marilyn

Criner, Elizabeth not present

Conley, Paula Eaton, Curtis

Szofran, Nancy for Greg

Fitch Joslin, Ann Leaf, Bill

Marley, Representative Bert

not present

Tilman, Representative Fred Burton, DeVere for Gerald

Meyerhoeffer Newby, Vern

Higher Education Information

Technology Committee

HEITC)

Hammon, Darrel

Public Education Information Technology

Committee (PEITC):

Black, Pete Conley, Paula

Gibson, Christopher

Mikelson, Ray

Regional Advisors:

Simpson, Corey for Heidi Rogers Coleman, Scott Kennedy, Eddie

Thorsen, Carolyn Sammons, Dorothy

Deans, Colleges of Education:

Gentry, Dale Hill, Janette

Garrett, Joyce Lynn

Bureau of Technology Services

(BOTS)

Mincer, Rich Krun, Lynda Merritt, Sherawn Rood, Christine

Wilson, Dawn Zalucha, Dawn

Guests:

Anderson, Darin Borden, Ross Boyd, Bruce

Breithaupt, David

England, Bob Farnsworth, Bill

Gray, Nancy

Lanz, David

Little, Mark

Mancini, Pat

Marconi, Min McGrath, Deb

Moon, Jerald

Morris, Rita

Munden, Gerald

Powers, Stephanie Reininger, Jerry

Reininger, Jerry

Schamber, Shane

Shinn, Jeff

Simpson, Corey

Stevens, Bob

Vikie, Donna

Terrio, Dan

Tubbs, Heidi

Jerry Tuchscherer

Waller, Ruth West, Bob

<u>Introductions, Opening Remarks and Minutes:</u> Meeting began 9:06 a.m. Senator Melvin Richardson gave a warm welcome to committee members and guests. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present. Nancy Szofran sat in for Greg Fitch, DeVere Burton for Representative Gerald Meyerhoeffer. Each member and guest introduced himself or herself. Vern Newby motioned to accept the minutes as written; DeVere Burton seconded the motion. The vote passed unanimously.

Senator Richardson attended the Higher Education Committee meeting December 13th. The new K-20 committee, which includes K12 and Higher Education, will change to K-Life. This will incorporate all ages of education.

<u>Higher Education updates:</u> Ann Joslin - Member of ICTL and Chair of the Higher Education Information Technology Committee (HEITC), gave a brief update on the activities of the HEITC committee. The HEITC Vision and Mission statement is in draft form. A final format will be handed out at the next ICTL meeting.

December 14, 2000 Meeting Approved Minutes

The committee is working on a K-Life Technology Plan. This meetings guest speaker Gary Graves highlighted the formulation of the new K-Life plan. This plan will align with the State Board of Education's four goals: Access, Efficiency, Relevance, and Quality. The group identified key elements for Higher Education, which includes the institutions and agencies under the State Board of Education. A meeting is scheduled for February 1st, to continue working on the plan.

The intent of HEITC is to work as a policy laboratory. As this committee identifies opportunities and works on policies, they will make recommendations. Models will be created and ideas will be beta tested.

<u>Digital Millennium Act</u>– Ann Joslin: Basic Information on Digital Millennium document was reviewed. Copyright law in a digital environment is before the legislature. This law had a definite impact on library services, distance education, and digital preservation. Further information will be presented to the ICTL at a later date.

<u>Virtual High School</u> – Question arose and discussion took place relating to virtual high school and copyright law. ICTL will be updated as information becomes more available from the State Board.

There have been several meetings between the Bureau of Technology Services (BOTS), State Department of Education (SDE), and Idaho Association School Administrators (IASA). The committees reviewed needs for virtual courses for high school students. A presentation will be made to the ICTL in April on the Virtual High School. Cost and course development is presently under investigation.

ARTEC - Advanced Regional Technical Coalition, involving 19 institutions, has focused on professional, technical, and vocational courses. The possibility of teaching courses in one school and broadcasting to other schools at the same time is being explored.

<u>IDANET – Mark Little and John Olsen</u>: IDANET is a proposal to establish a shared statewide digital communication infrastructure for the State of Idaho. It is a modernized network that would provide high-speed digital bandwidth capabilities transmitting voice, video, and data information more efficiently.

In August, a committee was formed to review the Request for Proposal (RFP) application. Solutions received were not adequate for the State of Idaho, therefore in September the RFP was cancelled. The problems are being reviewed for future solutions. Challenges are getting access to rural areas and providing affordable access to Intranet. A report to the legislature will be read in January.

<u>Regional Technology Advisors (RTAs) Updates - Carolyn Thorsen:</u> Regional Technology Advisors (RTAs) are charged with training, testing, evaluating district technology plans, and researching the effect of student learning. Training is done on campus, on site, and online to rural areas. In the space of less than one year, 0 to 70 students were added with online services. Testing programs have gone on very well with over 6,000 teachers, of which 2,500

December 14, 2000 Meeting Approved Minutes

were out of state. The real training challenge is the integration of technology in teaching. Of those who have taken the test, in state -85% passed, and out of state - 50% passed.

Dean Gentry – In-service education: Beginning funding for teacher training was \$1,000,000.00, and was cut in half last year. The budget, cuts, and effects of the cuts were discussed.

Stephanie Powers an independent contractor sitting in for Heidi Rogers, assists Heidi and school districts with their technology plans. Stephanie stated there is a need for training teachers to integrate technology into the curriculum. She emphasized the need to continue assisting teachers in technology integration.

Dottie Sammons – Dottie explained the portfolio assessment test. Over 1400 teachers and administrators have passed the portfolio. Due to lack of funds and cutbacks, onsite delivery has been cut back.

Eddie Kennedy – The ICTL funds have provided 95% of onsite training. The RTAs attended a conference in Washington DC. They heard how to address issues with release time for teachers to receive training. A video showcasing technology in K12 classrooms was viewed at this time.

Dean Gentry – Dale gave a brief history of the allocation formula. The allocation for teacher training was reduced from \$1,000,000.00 to \$500,000.00. The institutions who receive funds are the four colleges and universities that have teacher training programs, two community colleges (North Idaho College and College of Southern Idaho), and Easter Idaho Technical School; which share in the Idaho State University (ISU) allocation.

The allocation formula was revisited this year for a solution to balance distribution. A permanent solution has not been formulated. A revised budget and recommendation formula will be presented to the legislature in April. The revised formula will be reviewed and voted on after the Legislative session in April.

Point of Order: The ICTL has historically asked for two groups of money; \$1,000,000.00 for teacher training which is through the State Board of Education to the Universities; the \$10.4 million for K12 that comes through the ICTL to the State Superintendent's budget. The \$1,000,000.00 request will be presented to JFAC January 23, 2001. Since there is no carry over authority, any remaining funds are distributed to the districts at the end of the year.

<u>Technology Competency Discussions</u>: By the year 2001, 90% of teachers will meet technology competency. Currently 70% of teachers statewide have passed the competency test. A list of teachers passing the competency test was reviewed. Teacher preparation programs and integrating technology in the classroom was discussed in depth.

The K12 sub committee discussed the competency testing and tying this to either accreditation and or certification. The State Board will make a recommendation in the form

December 14, 2000 Meeting Approved Minutes

of a letter to the ICTL: the 90% rule will be revisited (September or October) from accreditation to certification.

<u>Assessment Update</u> - Dr. David Breithaupt: Public Education Information Technology Committee (PEITC) committee requested that Dr. Breithaupt come up with an efficient and effective way to spend the \$30,000.00, which is set aside from the ICTL budget for evaluation.

The existing problem lays in the packaging and accumulation of data for an evaluation. Having this under the ICTL will help receive the needed information for Legislature. A suggestion was made to use the \$30,000.00 for creating and presenting a final and proper format to the districts, so they can carry out the evaluation and data collection information task.

Recommendation: to have a thorough and effective evaluation plan, to use the \$30,000.00 to leverage a state evaluation through the ICTL. Three proposals are: continue with the Phase I data collection and counts, ICTL staff or contractors assistance the districts in the various regions, and ICTL would contract for external evaluations by an outside agency with current guidelines and funds.

From each district's grant, 4-7% has been set aside for evaluation. The 3% will go to the districts for the evaluation and reporting activities for data collection, and 4% to be held back by the ICTL to fund technical evaluation support and contract for a statewide external evaluation. A document showing an estimation of the technology grants for the year was reviewed and discussed. It was pointed out that districts are not required to use 4-7% on evaluation.

Senator Melvin Richardson asked the Assessment and Evaluation be turned over to Bill Leaf and the K12 committee for review. They are to examine the need for assessment and evaluation (consider including the Deans, RTAs, Dr. Breithaupt, and information from the districts for assistance), and bring back a plan to the ICTL. Bill Leaf stated that he would take this task to the committee for study and recommendation.

<u>Budgets</u> – A document showing budgets for 1999 through 2002 was reviewed and discussed. After the first year-1994, the need for permanent staffing - added a half time secretary and full time telecommunications person. In 1999, the legislature changed the committee from K12 to K20, and a half time secretary to full time. The telecommunications specialist position is still open and will be filled.

The State Board requested ICTL write a new State Technology plan. The K12 has used Goals 2000 funds for the writing of the grant, which will run out this year. The Higher Education has no funds to write a plan.

A request was made to increase the Higher Education budget from \$10,000 to \$15,000 and \$50,000.00 to assess and write a K-Life plan, also to continue the \$30,000.00 for an

December 14, 2000 Meeting Approved Minutes

evaluation study. The \$50,000.00 would be a one-time request for writing a plan and would not be included in the base.

The \$10.4 million request has been submitted to Legislature to be included in the State Superintendent's budget. Albertson's funds will end this month, and the only funds that will continue to go to the districts will be the money from the legislature and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. Since the schools will be loosing close to \$16,000,000.00 in funds, a request was made to increase the \$10.4 in the next budget.

Motion #1: Vern Newby motioned to approve the \$10.4 million for ICTL expenditures are submitted to the Legislature. Ann Joslin seconded the motion.

Substitute Motion #1s: Fred Tillman made a change to the motion - to accept the \$10.4, but deduct the Higher Education \$50,000.00 request from the \$65,000.00, but increase the \$10,000.00 budget to \$15,000.00. Curtis Eaton seconded the motion.

A vote was taken on the motion and the amended motion:

 $\begin{array}{lll} \mbox{Senator Melvin Richardson} - \mbox{No} & \mbox{Ann Joslin} - \mbox{Aye} \\ \mbox{Superintendent Marilyn Howard} - \mbox{Aye} & \mbox{Bill Leaf} - \mbox{Aye} \end{array}$

Paula Conley – Aye

Curtis Eaton - Aye

Gerald Meyerhoeffer – Aye

Nancy Szofran in place of Vern Newby - Aye

Greg Fitch - No

There were eight Aye's and two No's, the vote was passed.

<u>K12</u> and <u>K20</u> Technology <u>Updates</u> - Rich Mincer made some general comments on technology trends. A couple of articles were reviewed on Internet devices and/or electronic books. Networks have been developed in Idaho for not only e-mails and research, but also to distribute content around the district. At the last count, there are somewhere around 400 educational portals for K12. Content can be pulled into the classroom very easily through the educational portals.

Through the Albertson's grant, school districts are encouraged to establish their networks and set up proxy servers (a place to store educational content and use it on the intranet). Some of the publishers distributing education content are: Scholastic, McGraw, Harcourt, and Pierson. Idaho is in the perfect place to head in this direction, because we have our proxy servers in place and networks well established.

<u>Data Driven Decision Making</u>: The state will provide support to districts as they turn their attention to gathering data for the purpose of making instruction decisions, based on how students are responding to standards. This will give us the ability to see if the students are meeting those standards. As the state moves through this process, the council will be updated. A group of six to ten superintendents, along with the Idaho Association of Administrators (IASA), will meet with the department on a regular basis. This group will

December 14, 2000 Meeting Approved Minutes

look at all the present data gathering and come up with a better plan, i.e. when and what the state collects and how will the data be reviewed and disseminated.

<u>Superintendent Marilyn Howard:</u> Data driven decision-making is a very important topic in the State Department, because of the interest in student learning. This is evidenced by the standards being presented to Legislature this year. Idaho benefits from its uniqueness of having a single Board of Education that handles all education matters, from reading in preschool to post graduate education, which helps us create a more productive system in the state. What data driven decision-making really is saying to us at the State Department of Education is, we will be providing a lot of support to local school districts as they turn their attention to gathering data for the purpose of making instructional decisions based on how students are responding to standards.

For the first time the department will have some expectations, and will want to know whether students are meeting those expectations. At this time, the department gathers a large amount of data from the districts for budgets and certification purposes. We also have information on transportation, instructional issues, and so forth. In the past, all information has come to us according to the formats set up in various bureaus. The department is hearing, and will continue to hear, how much time it takes to gather data, because reports are more sophisticated and the questions are more specific than they have ever been before.

I have asked the department to identify internal issues that need to be dealt with, and what issues need to be taken out to the field to work with districts around the state. Internally, we realize the need for a more efficient operation that enhances the abilities of districts to gather, analyze, and interpret data without added time burdens. There is a need for standardized and/or compatible software, so that data gathered can be utilized efficiently throughout the department. We must also be able to use this data for State and national purposes, if appropriate.

The department will evaluate and study districts' software currently in operation for capacity and capability needs to deal with the State's new expectations and requirements. We will look at servers across the state interfacing with other servers and databases, for networking capability. Collaborative communication with the districts is vital, since they have spent a lot of time, and in some places considerable dollars, putting in place the software packages that they hope would meet their district data management needs. So, with a variety of software in the districts, we are going to take a good look at interfacing all the data. We also hope to give some guidance to districts for future application upgrade purchases that would come from this collaborative effort.

Beyond this, knowing that we are doing all of this with the intent of improving student learning, we will look at what we can do to help increase the capacity of people, know what data to collect, respond to what ever questions they are asking, how to analyze that data, and use that data for good purposes.

With this collaborative effort, we foresee many needs being met. This is a very big project involving many different people with a wide variety of systems and software. The outcome

December 14, 2000 Meeting Approved Minutes

is going to be very important, because it does have money and people's time behind it. Ultimately, that time is going to be useful to advance our primary purpose: student learning.

<u>IASA (Idaho Association of School Administrators</u> - will take a leadership roll in the creation of the District Technology Coordinators Consortium. This consortium will aid and support districts and will have a united voice to the ICTL. A full day workshop for district technology coordinators is being formulated.

ICTL Distribution Summary: The committee reviewed several accountability reports on ICTL distributions. The reports were discussed in depth. A question was asked to define inkind. In-kind can be real dollars, time, materials, and other gifts that are above and beyond the ICTL and Grant dollars, to fulfill district technology plans. In kind is presently being reported in one lump sum. In-kind funds reported will be reviewed for accuracy, changes made, and reported at the next ICTL meeting. A suggestion was made to add a column for "Funds Received from Independent Sources." The Funding Formula will be discussed at a future ICTL meeting.

<u>Technology Grant Updates – Dawn Wilson:</u> J.A. & Kathryn Albertson Update - Opportunity I: A document reflecting inventory purchased by districts with the \$28 million award was passed out and reviewed. A final report will be presented at the next ICTL meeting.

Goals 2000 is a federal competitive grant that flows through the U.S. Department of Education. Idaho receives about \$2,000,000.00 for distribution to school districts based on competitive grant applications. Goals 2000 funds have been used for K12 technology and administrative costs. This grant will end this year.

Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF) is a \$2 million federal level competitive grant that flows through the U.S. Department of Education. This grant is for technology literacy for staff, students, and administrators. The application for TLCF is the same application for Goals 2000. Since the TLCF funds are received in October, we would like to send out the TLCF grant applications May 2001. We would like a postmarked deadline of November 19, 2001, read the grants at the December ICTL meeting, and then award the grants in January of 2002.

E-Rate is the Universal Service Fund. It is a federal program to bring discounted telecommunications to schools, libraries, and rural health care facilities. In year 1 there was \$4.5 million distributed, year 2 was about \$5 million, and year 3 is in the process of being awarded \$2.5 million.

There were statewide regional training workshops given to help go over the very complicated application process with the school districts. These workshops went well and were well attended. Priority 1 service is non competitive. Theses services are for discounts on phone bills and Internet access, i.e. telecommunications bills. Priority 2 services are for discounts on internal connections, such as: networking, servers, UPS for servers, routers, wiring for local area network, battery backups, and uninterruptible power supply, i.e. internal connections.

December 14, 2000 Meeting Approved Minutes

<u>K12 Recommendations – Bill Leaf</u>: Graduate Student Research Stipend assistance. No one applied for the \$10,000 out of the \$30,000 set aside for evaluations.

<u>Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation Grant</u> – Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation approached IASA with a \$750,000 matching grant. This grant will help with technology competency and move administrators to a higher level of proficiency. A proposal was presented to the ICTL members for review. The Grant Foundation has requested the IASA come up with matching funds of \$100,000.

Dr. Thorsen - The state has written a training grant for administrators, which is going very well and address Data Driven Decision Making. The Gates Foundation looks highly upon the State of Idaho. In their travels, during their presentations have referred other states to review what Idaho is doing and how it is working. The Gates Foundation's number one priority is Washington, Oregon and Idaho.

<u>ICTL 8 Goals align with the State Boards 4 Goals</u> – The essential structure of the 8 ICTL Goals in the book "Connections" are well defined. The K12 Committee reviewed the different concepts and needs within the goals. This committee decided to keep and maintain the eight ICTL goals; so that those components can be addressed and modified in the technology plans as appropriate and within the framework of the 4 State Board goals. The 8 ICTL goals will be reviewed by the ICTL at a future date for modification.

<u>ISTE Student Standards for Technology</u> – Stephanie Powers/Paula Conley made a recommendation that Idaho adopt the ISTE Student Standards for Idaho's student standards for technology. It is difficult to enforce the integration and use of technology in a classroom without the student standards being incorporated into the State's existing standards. It was noted this topic would be studied and addressed at a future date.

<u>Further Discussions and Final comments:</u> Senator Richardson asked K12 committee to come up with a plan for integrating technology into the classroom, and bring back a report to the next ICTL meeting. The ICTL needs to look at "where do we need to go from here." We must keep the vision, and move ahead.

Rich Mincer - The ICTL needs to review Higher Education funding and technology in the Colleges and Universities. A year and a half ago, the State Board requested ICTL examine technology in the colleges, how to improve the use of technology in the classes, and professors using technology for instruction. These topics will be brought up at a later date. The next ICTL meeting will be April 12. The meeting adjourned 3:25.